

### REMARKS

The Office Action of 05/07/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 10, 15-18, 20 and 21 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter, which indication is appreciatively acknowledged.

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Wordelman. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 11-13 and 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wordelman in view of Ward. Claims 4, 5 and 9 were rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination further in view of Balan. Claim 14 was rejected as being unpatentable over the same base combination further in view of Burgoon. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited references. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, the claims have been amended to recite more particularly the differential nature of the oscillator circuit, including that the oscillator crystal is connected differentially (see Fig. 3 of the present specification).

Wordelman teaches a single-ended circuit design. Ward was cited as teaching a differential oscillator amplifier in a crystal oscillator circuit. Ward, however, relies upon the high-ohmic parallel resonant mode of the crystal, whereas Wordelman relies upon the low-ohmic series resonant mode of the crystal. For this reason, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of the references in the manner indicated.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-11 and 13-21 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Ure', is written over a horizontal line.

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 11/07/2007